

Published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.  
Subscription price, \$2.00 per annum, payable strictly in advance.  
In St. Louis, Canada, and in foreign countries, \$2.10.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized October 5, 1918.

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

*Published by the*

Evangelical Lutheran Synod

*of*

Missouri, Ohio, and Other States.

---

Vol. VII. — MAY, 1927.

---

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Edited by the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

PROF. W. ARNDT, *Managing Editor pro tem.*, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Items whose authorship is not indicated are by the managing editor  
*pro tem.*

---

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
Lowering the Standards of Indoctrination .....	129
The Virgin Birth of Christ .....	133
The Theological Observer .....	145
Book Review .....	153

---

## Please Take Notice.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "May 27" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VII.

MAY, 1927.

No. 5.

---

## Lowering the Standards of Indoctrination.

P. E. KRETZMANN, St. Louis, Mo.

There can be no question with regard to the importance of the topic which is here given, for the Bible itself makes it a point to show just what the Lord expects of the members of His Church. Among the very last words of our Savior we have His great commission to His disciples until the end of time: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" Matt. 28, 19, 20. While for child-membership in the Church it is sufficient for such a child to be baptized, since by Baptism it receives the grace of God, we begin the special teaching of children at a very early age, in fact, as soon as they are able to pronounce the first words. We encourage the mothers to teach their little children appropriate prayers and also small verses from the Bible. We provide material in the form of pictures and simple Bible stories. We emphasize some of the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, such as the truth concerning Jesus Christ, the God-man, the Savior of the world. We also establish various institutions for the training of the young. Before we receive children into adult membership, we give them a special course of instruction in the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, so that they may be able to examine themselves before going to Holy Communion. 1 Cor. 11, 28.

That this course pursued by us, which is lauded most highly by men of understanding outside of our own circles, is in full keeping with the Lord's will, appears from a number of passages. Thus St. Paul chides the Christians of Corinth for their slow progress in Christian knowledge. He writes: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk and not with meat; for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able." 1 Cor. 3, 1, 2. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews makes a similar remark when he calls his readers to task for their slow

progress in learning the truth of Scriptures. His words will bear repeating: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God and are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the Word of Righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Heb. 5, 12—6, 2. These admonitions are altogether in keeping with other sections of the Bible. Moreover, the Bible demands a certain standard of knowledge before a person may properly become a member.

These standards may be summarized as follows. Generally speaking, they demand an instruction in the doctrines of the Bible, which enables the Christian to make an adequate examination of his life in agreement with the Ten Commandments. In connection with this there is the second demand, that every Christian who partakes of the Lord's Supper must actually be able to discriminate between this meal and ordinary eating and drinking. 1 Cor. 11, 29. From these demands there follows the further necessity of having all members of our Church distinguish between truth and falsehood in fundamental doctrines. If any one is not clear in the doctrine of justification, the chances are that he will in some manner base his faith upon his own strength and works, thereby depriving himself of the full benefit of the Lord's Supper. The same holds true if a person has no adequate conception of the person and the work of Christ, the entire doctrine of atonement. In fact, the various chief doctrines of the Bible are so closely related that it is impossible to set aside any one of them without endangering the entire structure.

It is in this connection that we wish to call attention to a strong tendency which is becoming manifest, not only in isolated cases, but in fairly large circles, namely, the tendency toward lowering the standards of indoctrination. We are not prepared to say whether this tendency is in any way connected with the modern idea of the potency of numbers. In some cases it may be due to mistaken ideals or to false zeal. But whatever the case, it behooves us to look at the situation with the greatest care.



The standards of indoctrination are lowered in some cases if pastors and congregations are satisfied with Sunday-school work *alone*, that is, if no other provision is made to inculcate the doctrines of the Bible in the minds of the children before they are admitted to the final catechumen class. As most Sunday-schools are being conducted, they are not able to devote more than thirty to forty-five minutes a Sunday to the regular lesson of the day. This lesson will, as a rule, comprise a story from the Bible, with doctrinal application, and some drill in the text of the Catechism, in proof-texts, hymn verses, and prayers. Now, it is true that the Sunday-school literature of our Synod has certain high qualities in mind. The lessons are assigned with a view of their doctrinal content and their teaching of Jesus, the Savior. The system is both uniform and graded, the circle being enlarged every two years. The lesson facts as taught in the lower grades are repeated and supplemented in the Intermediate Department by additional details and an application in keeping with the children's development at that time. The spiral method is further employed in the Senior Department, when the lesson text, practically that of the Bible, is supplemented with much historical material and the application made entirely from the doctrinal side. If this material is thoroughly drilled, also in the so-called Catechism Department of the Sunday-school, it may be possible to have children know approximately one hundred Bible stories, the text of the Small Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther, and possibly a hundred proof-texts, by the time they are ready to be received into the catechumen class. — But even at best there is something lacking for full indoctrination. Just as a child may very well learn the fundamentals of arithmetic in approximately a hundred lessons, but would hardly become a mathematician on the basis of such a meager training, so the child may have a mental or memory knowledge of many Bible facts and Catechism statements without having these terms become a real working knowledge in life. We have rightly been saying in the past that the instruction in the Word of God must enter the very flesh and blood of the children in order to be effective. This ideal can hardly be reached even with the best Sunday-school training. After all, five lessons a week devoted to the training in the Word of God are bound to accomplish more than only a half hour a week, which is often inadequate from a number of angles.

A second way in which the standards of indoctrination may be lowered is found when certain pastors and congregations attempt

too much with a Sunday-school or an institution of the same nature. Since the International Sunday-school lessons have received so much publicity, the writers of the various commentaries on these lessons being praised as the most expert religious educators, the lessons have also been examined in our circles. Now, there can be no question concerning material which is taken from the Bible itself. The sections, as assigned, are parts of the Bible, and they undoubtedly have their value in making known great truths. But there are some objections which cannot be set aside. In the first place, the Bible itself makes a distinction between fundamental and less fundamental doctrines, between primary and secondary material. The literature used in our circles, as stated above, has as its chief characteristic the doctrinal side, particularly the facts concerning Jesus, the Savior. The lessons of the International series very often deal with secondary truths, interesting knowledge in themselves, but hardly from the standpoint of indoctrination. Besides, every lesson commentary based on the International series contains far too much material. The number of references, the mixture of archeological and historical material with that of doctrinal matters, is bound to confuse the average untrained teacher. It would even tend to confuse the trained teacher. And as for the children, they would, to paraphrase an ancient German proverb, not be able to see the forest for trees. In this respect one may very well say that he who does less will usually accomplish more, and he who attempts the impossible, according to pedagogical information, will lower his standards of indoctrination.

These standards may, furthermore, be lowered when pastors and teachers, in preparing children for confirmation, after they have attended nothing but a Sunday-school, try to get along without training-classes or their equivalent. It is a prime requisite of a good class of catechumens that they already possess a memory knowledge of the Catechism and of the chief Bible stories used by way of proof. If a pastor is employed in doing a great deal of drill work, when he ought to be engaged in unfolding the text itself, the children are going to lose, and the result is bound to show in the future. Almost the same disadvantage is connected with the practise of some pastors, who turn over not only training-classes, but also the catechumen classes, to others. We must become more fully conscious of the purpose connected with catechumen work, namely, to prepare children (and adults) for adult membership in the congregation. This includes not only the privilege of receiving the Lord's Supper, but also the fundamental training with regard to the entire



Christian life. The pastor himself must feel the necessity of connecting pastoral work with his catechumen classes. While the emotional side cannot be stressed too strongly, all catechumens should become conscious of the fact that religion is not a matter of merely the head and the mind, but of the heart and the soul. Therefore the pastor himself should, all things being equal, have charge of the catechumen class, so that the standards of indoctrination, in this respect, may not be lowered.

But the chief mistake, in many cases, has been made with regard to adults. While it is very hard to make definite rules concerning the number of lessons to be given, and while many applicants for membership in our Church may have a fairly wide knowledge of Scripture terms, it will never do to have willingness take the place of conviction. If people have had a fairly thorough training in fundamental doctrines before they apply for membership in a Lutheran congregation, it may often be sufficient to study just certain points of difference in which the knowledge is particularly deficient. At the same time no pastor can really be satisfied with just a few lessons on certain fundamental points, much less with a series of sermons, the hearing of which is taken for granted and the assent to which is taken in lieu of a confession of the heart. It is a very difficult thing to prepare even an adult for membership in a Lutheran church in less than twenty to forty lessons. If one attempts more by doing less, the chances are that we shall soon have a membership which is not really a membership by conviction, but only by force of circumstances. This ought to be avoided by all means. It is time that every one concerned in this discussion take an analyzed inventory in order that he may be ready to give an answer for every soul entrusted to him, lest the accusation of being unfaithful in any one department of our work be made against us with some show of justice.

---

### The Virgin Birth of Christ.

Essay read before a conference by REV. G. ALBERT SCHULZE and published at its request.

The vehement attacks made upon the Virgin Birth of our Savior by modern theologians dare not be ignored by us. For faith in the Virgin Birth has ever been a cherished article of Christian faith. Confession of it was incorporated in the Creed of the early Church and has survived to this day in the Ecumenical Creeds to which the vast majority of Christians subscribe and which

have been received into the Symbolical Books of our beloved Lutheran Church, which confesses its faith in this doctrine also in several of its particular confessions. Moreover, we look upon this doctrine as a source of much comfort. Hence, I dare say, we are agreed that the subject of the essay assigned to me is important and timely.

If we were Roman Catholics, we might not feel any need of discussing the Virgin Birth. In the *Sunday Visitor* of August 24, 1924, Rev. H. C. Semple, S. J., writes: "Why do I believe the Virgin Birth? Because the Church teaches it. Because God told it to my Mother, and my Mother told it to me. Because I say in my Act of Faith: 'O my God, I firmly believe all the sacred truths which Thy Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches, because Thou hast revealed them, who canst neither deceive nor be deceived.' In every age of the last nineteen centuries this has been the reason why every Catholic has believed in every sacred truth revealed by God and proposed by the Church. . . . This has ever been the reason of every Catholic's belief in every article of the Apostles' Creed, and thus of his belief, not only in the divinity of our Lord, but also in the virginity and perpetual virginity of Our Lady. For the Church has ever taught that Mary is the Virgin, and thence she is Blessed Mary ever Virgin." But, thank God, we are not sons of the "Holy Father," and so we do not think very highly of a *fides carbonaria* concerning any point of doctrine. We hold that *Verbum Dei solum condit articulos fidei*. We want the assurance that the doctrine that Jesus was born of a virgin is taught in the Word of our God. Though we do not care very much what the Roman Catholic Church teaches, we are, of course, interested, deeply interested, in the testimony of faithful adherents to the Word of God as to this doctrine also. And if for no other reason, then at least from a desire to silence the Old Adam within us, we cannot well escape feeling a need of being able to refute the objections of the opponents of the Virgin Birth and exposing the fallacy of their arguments.

In the following I will endeavor to show that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is plainly taught in the Scriptures, that it is accepted by faithful teachers of the Church, both past and present, and that the attacks made upon it by avowed enemies and professed friends of the Christian faith are groundless. I purpose to show:—

I. *The Virgin Birth of Christ is explicitly taught by Matthew and Luke.*

II. *The Gospel of Mark and the other New Testament Scrip-*



tures contain nothing that can be construed as a denial of the Virgin Birth.

*III. The Virgin Birth is foretold in the Old Testament.*

*IV. The doctrine of the miraculous person and work of Christ involves the miracle of His birth from the Virgin.*

*V. The Virgin Birth has been universally accepted by the Church of the New Testament.*

*VI. Denial of the doctrine that Jesus is virgin-born is without foundation.*

### I.

That Jesus was born of a virgin mother is taught in plain, clear, unmistakable language in Matt. 1, 18—23 and Luke 1, 26—37. A careful perusal, indeed, the most superficial, reading of these two narratives can hardly have any other effect than to convince the reader that both Matthew and Luke believe, and would have their readers believe, that Jesus was born of a virgin pure and undefiled, who had not had sexual intercourse with a man. It almost seems incredible that any one who professes to accept the Bible as the inspired Word of God should express any doubts that God would have us believe the Virgin Birth of Him whom we call our Lord. The plain words of the evangelists should forever dispel from our minds every vestige of uncertainty on this point. If it were merely stated that the mother of Jesus was a *παρθένος*, there might be some excuse for doubting her virginity in the sense in which we are accustomed to use the term; but the explicit and repeated negation of Christ's having been born as a result of Mary's having come together with a man and the positive declaration that His miraculous conception by the Holy Ghost was the cause of His birth establish beyond the shadow of a doubt that He has no human father and renders superfluous any investigation of the Greek term *παρθένος*.

A comparison of the two passages, however, may seem to reveal some discrepancies, and these have been urged by some as proof that, whatever Matthew and Luke may say about the birth of Christ, their testimony must be thrown out of court. Luke, for instance, mentions the fact that Joseph and Mary were residents of Nazareth; Matthew does not mention their native town, but speaks as though they had not been in Nazareth before the birth of the holy Child. Chap. 2, 23. This difference in the two accounts has been pointed to by some (Soltan) as a contradiction. The unprejudiced reader, however, will find it rather difficult to discover

a real contradiction. The fact that Matthew does not say that Nazareth had been the home of Joseph and Mary does not prove that he would denounce Luke as a liar and that, therefore, the two reports which we have of Christ's birth do not agree and consequently cannot be true. Of course, if we encountered a palpable discrepancy here, we could not avoid drawing the conclusion that we are not dealing with the infallible Word of God and that, hence, it is not safe to accept the words of the evangelists as divine truth. But there is no contradiction.

The accounts of the two writers agree beautifully, perfectly, throughout. Though a careful study will reveal many other points of difference than the one already mentioned, though, *e. g.*, Matthew tells us more about Joseph and his emotions than about Mary, yet we cannot but say that the points in which they agree outnumber by far those in which they differ. In both passages, for instance, it is said: 1) that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Matt. 1, 18. 20; Luke 1, 35; 2) that His mother was a virgin, Matt. 1, 18. 20; Luke 1, 27. 34; 3) that Mary was espoused to Joseph, Matt. 1, 18; Luke 1, 27; 4) that Joseph was of the house and lineage of David, Matt. 1, 16. 20; Luke 1, 27; 5) that it was God's command that Mary's Son should bear the name Jesus, Matt. 1, 21; Luke 1, 31; 6) that the annunciation of the conception of the Lord was accompanied by the appearance of an angel, Matt. 1, 20 f.; Luke 1, 27 f. If we include the second chapter of Matthew and the second chapter of Luke in our comparison, we shall discover a number of additional coincidences in the two accounts, *e. g.*, that Jesus was born in the days of Herod, that He was born in Bethlehem, that He was called Savior, etc. In fine, the two evangelists have evidently reported independently of each other, and their reports are not contradictory, but supplementary.

Neither is either of the two sacred writers guilty of contradicting the other one. Human reason, the old rainmaker (as Luther loves to call it), is so half-witted that it does not hesitate to adduce the two genealogies of Christ contained in Matthew and Luke as evidence that the thought of Christ's being the son of a virgin never entered the minds of the writers. Orr (*The Virgin Birth of Christ*) quotes Lobstein as saying: "*Es kann kein Zweifel sein, dass nach dem Urtheil beider Genealogen Jesus der Sohn Josephs ist*" (p. 110). Matthew and Luke, whom we must certainly credit with sufficient intelligence to understand the simple words of their own records, who certainly were not so ignorant as not to know the meaning of the word *virgin*, do not seem to have felt that the genealogies and



their doctrine of the Virgin Birth were contradictory; indeed, Matthew prefaces his account of the Virgin Birth with the genealogy in order to prove that Jesus is the legal heir of Joseph. Moreover, we must not overlook the fact that both Matthew and Luke carefully avoid making the statement that Joseph is the father of Jesus. Matthew is extremely accurate in the matter. He says: "Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus" (1, 16). Luke is equally careful in the choice of his words; he begins his genealogy with the words: "Jesus . . . being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph (3, 23). Whether you regard both genealogies as presenting the family tree of Joseph, or whether you believe that Matthew traces Joseph's descent and Luke that of Mary, you cannot use the genealogies as a lever to overthrow what the writers say about the Virgin Birth. Neither of them contradicts himself by saying that Jesus was virgin-born and that He was not virgin-born.

Matthew and Luke remain consistent with themselves to the end. There is nothing in the writings of either that does not harmonize with the opening statements of their productions. It has been said by some that their application to Jesus of the title "Son of David" proves that they do not mean what they say when they speak of Him as the son of a virgin (*vide* Matt. 9, 27; 12, 23; 21, 9; Luke in several places). If the writings of Matthew and Luke did not contain this appellation and Mark and John used it, we might perhaps be somewhat taken aback and — in a moment of doubt as to the divine inspiration of the Scriptures — begin to reason within ourselves: Matthew and Luke call Jesus the son of a virgin, but the other two evangelists call Him the Son of David; here is a contradiction. But since this expression is used by the very writers who record the Virgin Birth, and that, too, in immediate connection with their accounts of Jesus' birth (Matt. 1, 1; Luke 2, 4 f.), it is perfectly clear that, though we may grant that both contain the genealogy of Joseph, their purpose cannot at all be to designate Joseph as the natural father of Jesus, but merely to show that through His connection with Joseph, Jesus is entitled to hereditary claim upon the throne of David, that is, that Joseph is the father of Jesus according to the law. Or are we ready to charge Matthew and Luke with such lack of intelligence that they were capable of declaring emphatically and in the same context that Jesus is of the house and lineage of David and that He has no human father, if these two statements were contradictory? Moreover, it is not by any means certain that Luke purposes to trace the ancestry of Joseph; on the contrary, there is much internal

evidence that he purposes to show the descent of Mary, a relative of Joseph (Edersheim, Ebrard). Davis (*Dictionary of the Bible*) says: "The table in Luke gives the genealogy of Mary and shows Jesus to be the actual son of David. With the clear declaration of Luke that Jesus had no human father, with the customary usage of the Hebrew word 'son' for descendant, however remote, and on the basis of the approved Greek text, the advocates of this view render Luke 3, 23: 'Jesus being son (as was supposed, of Joseph) of Heli,' etc. Jesus, according to Luke, is grandson of Heli, Mary's father, and thus a lineal descendant of David. . . . This conception is probably correct." The genealogy at the head of Matthew's gospel, too, creates the impression that, though he gives us the family-tree of Joseph, he would intimate that Mary, too, is of the house of David. In fine, the two genealogies cannot be cited as witnesses disproving the Virgin Birth.

But do not the two evangelists sometimes call Jesus the son of Joseph? Do they not thus declare Joseph to be His father? It is true, in Matthew, for instance (13, 55) the question is asked, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Luke 4, 22 we encounter the question, "Is not this the son of Joseph?" John, by the way, also uses this expression (1, 45; 6, 42). A glance at the passages in which these names occur is sufficient to show that in every one of them we are dealing with a quotation of words spoken by people of Nazareth, Capernaum, Bethsaida, who, very likely, knew nothing of the miracle of Jesus' birth. Strange to say, the only other passages in which Jesus is called the son of Joseph are to be found in Luke. And still stranger — Luke uses this designation almost immediately after he had declared Jesus to be the son of the Virgin, namely, chap. 2, 27. 33. 41. 43. 48. He speaks of "the parents," of "His parents," of "His father and mother," and quotes Mary as saying, "Thy father and I." I fail to see how any can urge that these expressions prove that Jesus was born according to the ordinary course of nature. The very fact that Luke uses them is very significant, showing, as it does, that it never entered his mind that they might be looked upon as setting aside the doctrine of the Virgin Birth taught by him a few verses above. Before the law, Jesus was the son of Joseph. Before the law, Joseph was His father. For Joseph was the husband of Mary. It may well be, too, that Jesus called him father. — The two accounts that we have of the Virgin Birth are eminently satisfactory.

This is probably as good a place as any to inquire into the substance of the evangelists' teaching on the subject of Christ's



birth. It can be summed up under three heads: 1) That because of His birth from the Virgin Mary Christ is a true man; 2) that He was born a holy man; 3) that He is the Godman.

By virtue of His birth from the Virgin, Christ is a true man, a genuine human being. He is, as Elisabeth, filled with the Holy Ghost, exclaims, the fruit of the womb of Mary. The Angel of the Annunciation gave Mary the promise: "Thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son." Jesus drew human substance from the body of Mary. In her womb there developed an embryo, which, after the usual duration of pregnancy, came into the world as a child, a truly human child. This doctrine is corroborated by other writers of the New Testament. The author of Hebrews says: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same." Paul, in 1 Tim. 2, 5, calls the Lord "the man Christ Jesus." Throughout His earthly life Jesus gave constant evidence of His true humanity. The Scriptures, as Schwan says in his Catechism, attribute to Him the natural parts and ways of a man. The doctrine that Jesus had only a phantom body, as was taught by the Docetae, is nonsense and contrary to the Scriptures. The Bible also disproves the theory that in the case of Jesus the place of the human soul was taken by the λόγος (Arians, ἄψυχοι); that He had a body and a soul, but no νοῦς, the λόγος dwelling where the νοῦς should have been (Apollinarians); that He was possessed of body and soul, but not of a human will (Monothelites); that He brought with Him from heaven a body worthy of Himself, which passed through the sexual organs of Mary like water through a canal (Valentinus). Senseless theories like these have not yet totally disappeared. In the *Formula of Concord*, for instance, we are told that the Menonites did not believe that Jesus received flesh and blood from the Virgin Mary, but descended with them from heaven. Guenther (*Symbolik*) quotes the following from Schwenkfeld: "*Das Fleisch Christi hat keinen kreatuerlichen Anfang, sondern einen uebernaturlichen und neuen aus dem Samen seines Vaters, das ist, aus dem Heiligen Geist. . . . Christi menschliche Natur ist nicht gleich der menschlichen Natur der Tuerken.*" Champion (*The Virgin's Son*) says: "Dr. David Smith has lately presented the interesting view that Jesus had not only no human father, but no human mother. The Virgin Mary provided not even the ovum of the embryo, but only the nidus by which it was attached and through which it was nourished." Over against all speculations of this nature we maintain the *veritas et integritas humanae Christi naturae*.

Christ's Virgin Birth is a guarantee of His sinlessness. The Son of Mary is a man without sin. Otherwise the term *man* always connotes the idea of sin. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," John 3, 6. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. 51, 7. Sin is propagated by the propagation of the race. All that have human parents have sin. Christ is without sin. The angel in Luke speaks of "that Holy Thing" which shall be born of Mary. The holiness of Jesus is plainly taught not only here, but in many other passages, for instance, 2 Cor. 5, 21; Heb. 7, 26. In the case of Jesus the sinful features otherwise connected with human generation are totally absent. But is not Jesus' mother, a human being, contaminated with sin? Indeed, Mary is a sinner. The mere fact that she brought forth her Son in untouched virginity does not render her offspring holy. Had it pleased God to provide for the propagation of the human race after the fall of man by some other method than cohabitation of the two sexes, let us say solely by agency of the female sex, we should nevertheless be sinners. The suppression of man's part in the generation of a child is not in itself a protection against sinful origin. The Scriptures nowhere teach that the seed of a man is impure and that of a woman is holy. Christ is undefiled by virtue of the *causa efficiens* of His birth from the Virgin, because of the positive operation of the Holy Spirit in the origin of His human nature. If we lose sight of this fact, we are forced to accept the vagary of the Docetae, the Romish doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary, or the monstrous theory of a sacred germ which descended from Eve, was preserved in the people of Israel, and finally reached its maturity in the human nature of Christ. Christ — this is what God tells us — is sinless because of the connection of the Holy Ghost with the beginning of the existence of His humanity. He who caused His conception is perfectly holy and purifies and sanctifies the flesh and blood which Christ receives from His mother. In the case of Christ's birth the human act of begetting, which in the case of all other men is the beginning of existence, is excluded; a holy act, performed by the Holy Spirit, is substituted therefor; hence the evil consequences resulting from the human act of begetting are eliminated. Just how the Spirit wrought this great miracle Mary herself did not understand; and I dare say that we shall not be able to understand it either. The best that we can hope to do is to repeat what the Scriptures teach: The Holy Ghost came upon Mary, that is, the power of the Highest overshadowed her; and the result was



the conception and birth of Him whom the angel calls holy. — The Holy Spirit's connection with the birth of Jesus, however, cannot properly be termed an act of paternity. True, Matthew (1, 18, 20) says that Mary was pregnant ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. But ἐκ in this connection, as Gerhard says, is not ἐκ *materiale*, but ἐκ *potentiale*, that is, in the sense of efficient, operative cause (Baier, III, 27). The Holy Ghost was active in the conception and birth of Christ, not as communicating His substance, but rather as operative *ad extra*. *Ex Spiritu Sanctu conceptus est Christus οὐ σπερματικῶς, ἀλλὰ δημιουργικῶς* (Damascenus. Baier, III, 29). Athanasius: "*Inventa est in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto, non quod Salvatoris nostri pater dicendus Spiritus Sanctus, ut duo credantur patres, sed cum Patre et Filio idem Spiritus Sanctus cooperarius et unius potestatis est*" (*ibid.*). *Der ueber die Maria kommende Heilige Geist und die ueberschattende Kraft des Hoechsten wirkt bei der Empfaengnis Christi, . . . dass diese Masse, dadurch der Sohn Gottes Fleisch annahm, geheiligt, das ist, gereinigt und von der Suende geschieden wird, Hebr. 7, 26, damit das, was hernach geboren wird, heilig sei*" (Besser, *Echt evangelische Auslegung*; quoted in *Hom. Mag.*, 31, 74). Christ's challenge to His enemies to convince Him of sin is not an act of vain self-exaltation, as Strauss says. Nor does the challenge merely imply absence of all consciousness of wrong-doing, as Ritschl maintains. We shall, however, have occasion to enlarge upon this point in one of the following chapters.

The sacred writers teach that the Son of the Virgin is the Son of God. Matthew calls Him Immanuel, God with us. 1, 23. The angel announces to Mary that the Holy Thing that shall be born of her shall be called the Son of God. Luke 1, 35. In the man whom Mary brought forth the Son of God dwelleth as in a dwelling. That is the teaching, not only of Matthew and Luke, but of all the New Testament writers. The passages containing this truth are so numerous that one is almost in a quandary where to begin when desiring to make quotations. I would remind you only of John 1, 14, 18. This truth is taught in the Old Testament, too, *e. g.*, Micah 5, 1. It is presupposed in many passages, for example, John 8, 23: "I am from above," and in all the numerous passages in which Christ speaks of His coming into the world from the Father. According to the Scriptures, Jesus is not merely *Filius Dei nuncupativus*, but *Filius Dei essentialis*. The words of Luke: "Therefore (διό) also that Holy Thing . . . shall be called the Son of God," are cited as proof that Jesus merely bore the

title "Son of God." Hofmann writes: "*Weil heilig ist, was diesem Kind den Ursprung gibt, darum wird es heilig; und weil Gott selbst es ist, der ihm den Ursprung gibt, darum wird es Gottes Sohn heissen. Die Art und Weise, wie es seines Daseins Anfang nimmt, wird dies zur Folge haben, wenn es fuer das erkannt wird, was es dadurch ist.*" (Quoted in *Hom. Mag.*, 31, 73, from *Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments*.) Again: "*Demnach besagt die Stelle Luk. 1, 35, dass das Kind, welches durch Machtwirkung Gottes in der Maria seines Lebens Anfang gewinnt, um des willen Gottes Sohn heisst.*" (*Schriftbeweis; Hom. Mag.*, 31, 73.) Hofmann objects to the distinction made between the *generatio aeterna Christi* and the *generatio temporalis*. He is of the opinion that Jesus is the Son of God by virtue of His supernatural birth and hence not really God the Son. The teaching of Hofmann and other Arians is not the teaching of the Bible. When Luke says, "Therefore also," etc., we must not overlook the fact that he does not say *ἔσται*. He does not say that Jesus shall be the Son of God by virtue of His miraculous birth; but only this, that He shall be conceived and born in a supernatural manner and that *therefore* He shall be called, honored, praised, as the Son of God (*κληθήσεται*). His miraculous, extraordinary birth shall have the effect of bringing home to men the truth that He is more than a mere man, that He is the Godman. If we adhere to the Scriptures, we cannot but say: "*Maria hat durch Wirkung des Heiligen Geistes nicht nur eine Aussonderung und Heiligung ihres Fleisches und Blutes zur Bildung der menschlichen Natur Christi erfahren, sondern sie hat auch durch Wirkung des Heiligen Geistes ein Ich, eine Person, empfangen, die von Ewigkeit her ist und auch in alle Ewigkeit dieselbe bleibt, die nicht erst mit der Empfaengnis entstanden ist.*" (*Syn.-Ber.*, Mich., 41, p. 42.) If we discard the doctrine of the Incarnation, we may as well discontinue our discussion of the birth of Christ. For if Christ is not God and man in one person, then that which the Scriptures say concerning His birth is of little importance and significance. This point, too, will have to be taken up later.

The three points we have just considered are plainly taught in God's Word. Before proceeding to the next chapter, we should devote a little of our time to the consideration of doctrines which for years have been taught in connection with the Virgin Birth, though they are not set forth in the Scriptures. There is the doctrine, *e. g.*, that Mary brought Jesus into the world *clauso utero*, that is, that she remained a virgin even after the birth of the



Lord. Calvinists teach that Mary gave birth to Jesus *aperto utero* (Baier, III, 86). There is a reason for that; they deny the communication of attributes. Luther writes: "*Es disputieren auch etliche, wie diese Geburt geschehen sei, als sei sie [Maria] des Kindes genesen im Gebet, in grosser Freude, ehe sie es inne geworden ist, ohne alle Schmerzen. Welcher Andacht ich nicht verwerfe; vielleicht um der Einfaltigen willen also erfunden. Aber wir sollen bei dem Evangelio bleiben, das da sagt, sie habe ihn geboren, und bei dem Artikel des Glaubens, da wir sagen: 'Der geboren ist von Maria, der Jungfrau.' Es ist keine Truegerei hier, sondern, wie die Worte lauten, eine wahrhaftige Geburt. . . . Ohne dass sie ohne Suende, ohne Schande, ohne Schmerzen, OHNE VERSEHRUNG geboren hat, 1 Mos. 3, 16*" (St. L. 11, 123). The *Formula of Concord* says: "*Hoc modo (ut loco non circumscribatur, da er keinen Raum gibt noch nimmt) CREDITUR de sanctissima Maria natus esse*" (Trigl., 688, 100). We are not justified in elevating this doctrine to the dignity of an article of faith; nor do I believe that this is the intention of the *Formula of Concord*. I would not accuse the *Lutheran Commentary* of heresy because it contains the statement: "The ascetic spirit of the fourth century was not satisfied with the Scriptural teaching of the miraculous conception of Christ, but began to teach that His birth was also miraculous, that He came into the world without doing violence to the virginal and pure body of His mother" (ad James, p. 85). Baier says: "*Illud autem, quod quidam putant, Mariam clauso utero peperisse Filium, incertum est*" (III, 85). It is an open question.

Another point of this kind — we shall have to admit that we cannot with any degree of finality settle the question: *An Maria semper virgo?* Hastings, in his *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (sub *Mary*) says: "The view of overwhelmingly the larger part of Christendom is: *Virgo concepit, virgo peperit, virgo permansit.*" Luther writes: "*Weil niemand aus der Schrift beweisen kann, dass Maria hernach verrueckt sei, soll es auch niemand glauben, sondern sie fuer eine Jungfrau halten*" (19, 1370; 20, 1806; 12, 1226). In the Latin version of the *Smalcald Articles* we read: "*Filius . . . ex Maria, pura, sancta, sempervirgine.*"\* The views

---

\* It may not be amiss to refer here to the opinion of the sainted Professor Schaller, who holds (*Bibl. Christ.*, p. 62) that the passages quoted from the Confessions do not declare that Mary remained a virgin *ever after*, but emphasize that "*the birth of Christ made no change in her virginity.*" — ED.

of modern theologians (according to Pieper's *Dogmatik*, II, 367) are divided. In the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (Vol. XV, p. 450) we read: "The perpetual virginity of our Blessed Lady was taught and proposed to our belief not merely by the councils and creeds, but also by the early Fathers. The words of the prophet Isaiah (7, 14) are understood in this sense by St. Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, St. Justin, St. Chrysostom, St. Epiphanius, Eusebius, Rufinus, St. Basil, St. Jerome, Theodoretus, St. Isidore, St. Ildefonsus. St. Jerome devotes his entire treatise against Helvidius to the perpetual virginity of Our Blessed Lady; the contrary doctrine is called madness and blasphemy by Gennadius, madness by Origen, sacrilege by St. Ambrose, impiety and smacking of atheism by Philostorgios, perfidy by St. Bede, heresy by St. Augustine, and St. Epiphanius probably excels all others in his invectives against the opponents of Our Lady's virginity." The Bible does not mention the ἀειπαρθενεία. There are commentators who believe themselves justified in deducing proof of the contrary from the ἕως οὗ of Matt. 1, 25. But this passage makes no statement as to whether or not Joseph knew Mary after the birth of the Savior; cf. Gen. 8, 7; Matt. 28, 20. The application to Jesus of the term πρωτότοκος does not give us any information either as to Mary's subsequent life. If I tell you that I am the first-born of my parents, and you conclude from that statement that I have brothers and sisters, you are in error; I never had a brother or a sister. My assertion that I am the first-born is really non-committal as to the number of children in our family. Nor does the mention of brothers and sisters of Jesus (Matt. 13, 55, etc.) give us any clue as to whether or not Mary became the mother of children by Joseph. Tradition may be correct in believing the "brethren" of our Lord to have been brothers by adoption (sons of Alphaeus, also called Cleopas, a brother of Joseph). The *virginitas perpetua* is not contrary to Scripture, nor is it directly taught in God's Word. Prof. Gabr. Oussani, D.D., St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N.Y., says: "It must be admitted that, viewed as a historical fact, it has no explicit support in Scripture. The dogma must therefore be considered as a development, which development, strictly speaking, does not necessarily imply its theological or historical truth or falsehood" (Orr, *The Virgin Birth*, p. 294). In days gone by this professor would have got into a beautiful mess of trouble. When Helvidius and the Antidicomarianites of the fourth century denied the perpetual virginity of our Lord's mother, they were furiously attacked by St. Jerome and others. Even Luther says: "*Helvidius*,



*der Narr, wollte auch Marien mehr Soehne nach Christo geben . . . — der grobe Narr!*" But the fact remains that we can neither prove nor disprove from Scripture the *semper virginitas*. It is a man-made doctrine, which may, perhaps, be looked upon as being probably true, but is not an article of faith. And if a man like Dr. Weidner (Chicago Lutheran Seminary) writes: "The idea of the perpetual virginity of Mary arose from a false notion of the superior sanctity of unmarried life, a teaching which has no authority in the Word of God" (*Luth. Commentary*, ad James, p. 84), no one should on that account attack him as a heretic.

Finally, we might here refer to the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary, if that were necessary. This doctrine, however, is so palpably an invention of the Man of Sin, is so utterly without Scriptural foundation, indeed, so obviously at variance with the Word of God, which teaches the universal corruption of human nature, so conflicting with what the Bible otherwise teaches concerning Mary, and finally so far from explaining the Virgin Birth (really multiplying the miracle by two and thus only increasing our difficulties), that any one who still adheres to the Scriptures cannot but feel disinclined to waste time upon an attempt at a lengthy refutation.

(To be continued.)

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

**Winning Souls for Christ.** — This was the subject of the doctrinal essay read at the 1926 convention of the New South Wales District of the Ev. Luth. Synod in Australia. The author, Professor Winkler, based his remarks on five important propositions, which we herewith reprint: —

"1. Winning souls for Christ essentially consists in the definite and persistent effort of leading all spiritually unregenerated people with whom we come into contact to a clear knowledge of their sinfulness and utterly hopeless condition without Christ and to a definite acceptance of the full and free pardon of God for their sins purchased by Christ and presented to all in the Gospel. 2. To win souls for Christ is both the greatest privilege and the most sacred duty of every one who has himself found pardon and peace in the blood of Christ, his Savior. 3. In endeavoring to win souls for Christ, a Christian must, on the one hand, guard against encroaching upon the public ministry of the Word and, on the other hand, against proselytizing, or trying to win members from other Christian denominations. 4. To win souls for Christ, each individual Christian should daily embrace every opportunity and use every means of bringing the way of salvation to the notice of those whom he finds in ignorance

of it. 5. To win souls for Christ, a Christian congregation should make special efforts to reach out for the unchurched round about them and create special opportunities for bringing them under the saving influence of the Word of God."

The essayist's elaboration of the truths contained in these theses is able and beautiful.

**Dr. Hein of the Ohio Synod on the Lutheran World Convention and the Lutheran Brotherhood of America.**—The following remarks of Dr. Hein, President of the Ohio Synod, in his official report to his synod at its 1926 convention, will be read with interest:—

"Certain events in connection with the last meeting of the *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Konferenz*, which was held in Oslo after the Stockholm Conference, make it doubtful whether Lutheran consciousness will permit further participation in the Lutheran World Conference, unless the *Allgemeine Konferenz* disavows the declaration of its chairman. Furthermore, if it be true that there can be no concerted action on any religious matters until there is doctrinal unity, the question to us is whether, first of all, the aim of a Lutheran World Convention ought not, in the very nature of the case, be to bring about doctrinal unity among the participating bodies. If efforts in that direction are not being made, but are rather decried and repudiated, I fail to see that another World Convention can be of any benefit. As a matter of fact, the Lutheran Church of Europe is to a large extent Lutheran in name only, and the differences which separate the Lutherans beyond the sea are relatively much greater than those separating the Lutheran synods of America. . . . Under date of April 22, 1926, the president of the Lutheran Brotherhood of America requested me to appoint two delegates to represent the Joint Synod on the reorganization committee of the Lutheran Brotherhood of America. I declined to do so because in my estimation cooperation in the work of the L. B. A. presupposes church-fellowship, and in the Lutheran Brotherhood of America there are representatives of various synods with which the Joint Synod is not in fellowship."

Concerning the World Convention the Joint Synod of Ohio decided to send an official delegation to the next Lutheran World Convention and that the General President be included in the *personnel* of the delegation. It seems, then, that the Ohio Synod did not entirely share the views of its president with regard to this matter. Concerning the Lutheran Brotherhood of America, the Joint Synod of Ohio resolved to decline further participation. In view of the glaringly unionistic character of this Brotherhood, we are glad that this action was taken.

**Good News from the U. L. C.** — The correspondent for the Southern Conference of the Illinois Synod reports in the *Lutheran* of February 17: "Mount Carmel, Rev. John J. Gent, pastor. The church and pastor are being severely criticized locally because the church refused to enter the proposed Union Evangelistic Campaign, in which it is proposed to have Billy Sunday." — "St. Louis. St. Mark's. The Christian Endeavor Society has given place to a Luther League." — Editorial in same number of the *Lutheran*:



"A 'Fellowship Service' was held in San Fernando, in which about 400 persons participated. They not only represented the Episcopal, Methodist, 'Presbyterian Holiness' churches, but (tell it not in Gath) even the Roman Catholic, Christian Scientist, and Seventh-day Adventist persuasions. Fortunately the preachers took part in reading the Scriptures, but deemed it expedient to make no comments. No doubt, differences can be bridged over by ignoring them, but a fellowship of mere sentiment is many leagues removed from the fellowship of faith. There is a crying need for the latter." And another editorial of the same issue condemns the unionism as practised between Lutheran and Reformed preachers. It is "impatient of the propaganda of several advocates of unionism." The propaganda of Dr. Frederick Lynch is contained in his statement: "The Protestants look upon the Church as simply a voluntary association of believers, each of whom finds the seat of authority in the Bible and believes that grace is directly transmitted from God to the heart of the individual." The *Lutheran* replies: "If what he describes as their state of knowledge is true, conferences concerning Christian unity are premature. . . . Fancy Lutherans agreeing that 'the Church is simply a voluntary association of believers' and that 'grace is transmitted directly from God to the heart of the believers.'" That means, in plain language, that as long as the Reformed teach that "grace is transmitted directly from God to the heart of the believers," a wide gulf separates them from the Lutherans, and union is impossible.

E.

**There Is Still a Better Way.** — Calling attention to "the tragic absence of the vast majority of children from public worship," four hundred and fifty pastors of New York and vicinity sent out an appeal to parents to bring their children to worship at the regular service. Dr. Frederick Lynch, as reported by the *Lutheran*, points out in the *Christian Century* of December 16, 1926, that, since too many parents are themselves not consistent worshipers, something more is needed. The better way recommended by him is that the pastor meet regularly once a week with all the children between the age of twelve and fourteen and do three things: 1) Instruct them in the faith; 2) tell them about the Church, its history, its meaning, and its work; 3) put forth every effort to win them for Christ and His Church. He further insists that if strutting quartets or church choirs, whose only object is to entertain the congregation with sentimental ditties and ballads, "tinctured with religion," could be dispensed with and the voices of children substituted, much would be gained to make the services attractive in the higher sense of real worship. — There is still a better way, the old Lutheran way. The old Lutheran method has the pastor meet regularly with all the children between the ages of twelve and fourteen somewhat oftener than once a week. For the purpose of thorough instruction in the faith the Lutheran pastor wants to meet his catechumens daily, if possible, and for as long a period as possible, and after confirmation at least once a week for as long a period as possible. And the good Lutheran way sets the age limit quite a bit earlier. It provides for

the thorough instruction in the faith of the children between the ages of six and fourteen in the Christian day-school, aiming at *keeping* them for Christ and His Church. If all churches adopted the good old Lutheran way and, best of all, the good old Lutheran Catechism, what a mighty stream of blessings that would set loose! Here is the *Lutheran's* fine comment on Dr. Lynch's proposal: "All this is very much in line with what we Lutherans profess to advocate and practise. Our system of catechetical instruction has become the Church's strong arm of power to win and to hold the young. Wherever it is faithfully applied, the pastor gains a hold upon the young which no amount of preaching or teaching in the Sunday-school can begin to equal. There is his opportunity for intimate spiritual contact with the young as nowhere else. . . . But more needs to be done to win them for the service of the Church. Here is where much earnest and persistent effort needs to be put forth. We have visited Lutheran churches where the parochial school and catechetical instruction were given a high place and were deeply impressed to see the galleries filled with well-behaved children, who made the rafters ring with heavenly music as they joined in the worship. Until the parish school comes into its own and more effort is put forth to win the children for the service of the Church, the problem will remain unsolved. If every family were gathered into the pew, new life would come to the Church, its assemblies would swarm with children, and men would wonder what strange thing had happened." E.

**Where the Commentaries Failed.** — Dr. M. S. Rice, of Detroit, "one of the twenty-five most popular preachers of America," complained in a Lenten address given in St. Louis that none of the commentaries he consulted said anything on his text, 2 Cor. 1, 10. The remarks he made on the text dealt with salvation, the salvation wrought by Jesus, viewed first as history, secondly as experience, and thirdly as hope. The *Popular Commentary* has this: "The picture drawn by Paul is that of a powerful tearing away from a danger to which he had been exposed, an emergence from its teeth or jaws, through the almighty power of the Lord. This confidence he has, in this direction his trusting hope is directed." No commentary can give a different interpretation. The words interpret themselves. It is not surprising that all the commentaries consulted refused to help Dr. Rice in his attempt to preach on the salvation of Jesus from this text. — Besides selecting the wrong text for the great subject of his address, the speaker utterly failed in his presentation of the wondrous subject. The death of Jesus Christ as taking away the sins of the world was not once mentioned. Dr. Rice is a master of the art of public speaking. He spoke eloquently on the richness of the Bible and the great power of religion, but never touched upon the heart of the matter, the forgiveness of sins. What a glorious thing it would be if all of these twenty-five gifted preachers would preach Christ Crucified! E.

**Masonic Divorce.** — Under this caption Mr. B. M. Holt has sent the following interesting remarks: —

"The present attempt of Masonry to shove her spouse into the



ditch and to hand her ladies a lemon is nothing new. An item is going the rounds of the press that the chapter at Indianapolis has inaugurated a series of social hops for the season. The order was not organized for the purpose of dispensing hops, gratifying hoppers, or any sort of indecent gyratory and gymnastic displays. For what base purpose is the order being used! Shame! It was this and similar kinds of immoral exhibitions that brought upon the order in Chicago and other places an opprobrious title.

“‘If you wish to keep your title clear  
For a mansion in the skies,  
And of *boss female stars* have no fear,  
*Avoid fast ones* — and be wise!’

(*General History of Eastern Star*, by Engle, 1901, p. 55.)

“‘We are pronouncedly opposed to “hairpin” Masonry. We do not think that a tiled lodge or chapter is the place for males and females to congregate, and we know that Freemasonry, in its institution, its inherent character, and its present purpose, has no affiliating elements that render it homogeneous with a female secret society. *Masonry was not made for all men, and certainly it was made for no women.* . . . And shall it ever be that Ancient Craft Masonry will officially recognize “hairpin” Masonry and take it to its arms? Shades of King Solomon, forbid the banns! . . . Let those individuals who created this order alone recognize, and take care of, their illegitimate offspring.’ (Quoted from the *Philadelphia Keystone* by Engle, page 61.)

“About thirty years ago Ohio excluded the Eastern Star from her Masonic lodge rooms. England has never recognized the *fair bobtails*; and it’s not only the ‘Church’ that has ‘strife’ — Engle’s history of the O. E. S. is little beyond a compilation on lodge rivalry.”

**Why Jesus Is Not Popular To-Day.** — There is no doubt that Modernism is spreading in our country and that it will continue to spread. This is accounted for by Dr. Bell of St. Stephen’s College in an article published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, of which the *Lutheran* takes cognizance. In the February issue the latter writes: “In his article in the *Atlantic Monthly* (which often offends mightily by publishing articles on religion by writers who have not touched the hem of its garment) Dr. Bell of St. Stephen’s College tells us that Americans have no new gods, but worship the old-fashioned gods of the world, the flesh, and the devil. As to the third, he speaks of our tendency to glorify cleverness, wit, and conceit. He says: ‘Jesus of Nazareth is an enigma to the moment. Occasionally we find somebody trying to dress up the Christ in modern terms, presenting him as a go-getter, a country-clubber, a master of advertising psychology. There is no god but our god. We will make Jesus into our image. Popular though this sort of thing may be, it is, of course, not Christianity. Whatever else Jesus may mean, He is, in historical religion at any rate, the antithesis of all that our day deems most worth while. He is poor when we would be rich. He seems to regard chastity as normal and healthy. To Him comfort matters little one way or the other. He is the incarnation of humility. It can hardly be expected that He should be the chosen God of an

adolescent civilization, intent upon the hungry search for superficiality.'"

Dr. Bell has failed to state the main reason why Jesus is an offense to the present age, which glorifies "cleverness, wit, and conceit." The whole preaching of Christ was a protest against pharisaic work-righteousness, in which our superficial and supercilious age delights, and a perpetual declaration that sinners are saved alone through faith in Him. The two main tendencies of to-day, Modernism and lodgery, are a protest against the Gospel of Christ Crucified.

MUELLER.

**American Ambassador Reported at Heathen Shrine.** — Missionary A. J. Stirewalt, of Tokyo, Japan, writes in the *Lutheran* of February 17: "During his [the emperor's] illness the nation was deeply anxious, and Christians as well as others earnestly prayed for his recovery." 1 Tim. 2, 1. 2. "Many of the native faiths knelt on the ground before the palace in Tokyo. Others prayed at the temples and shrines. The following appeared under large head-lines, in the leading article, in the *Japan Times* of December 14. I quote it without comment: 'American Ambassador Reported at Heathen Shrine. His Excellency, Mr. Charles MacVeagh, the American ambassador, and Mrs. MacVeagh, have made regular visits to the Meiji Shrine during the past week to pray for the recovery of His Majesty, the Emperor. Visitors to the great shrine at Yoyogi in the afternoons have often seen Mr. and Mrs. MacVeagh unassumingly approach the shrine entrance in their victoria. After delivering prayers for the emperor, the American ambassador and his wife return to their carriage and unostentatiously return to their residence.' " We, too, have no comment to offer as long as the church affiliation of our ambassador is unknown to us. For if it should turn out that he is an agnostic or a radical Modernist or a Freemason, his action would be more or less consistent.

E.

**Evils of Dancing.** — On this subject the *Australian Lutheran*, the official organ of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod in Australia, writes: "The following bit of cable news is very illuminating: 'With a view to safeguarding the morals of youths of both sexes the police are closing dancing-halls started under licenses issued from Angora. Grave allegations are made in regard to the effect of the dancing upon respectable girls, scores disappearing in a few weeks. Many, it has been found, have adopted a life of immorality. The police have been ordered strictly to control dancing-schools, the pupils of which must produce the written consent of their parents.' The modern promiscuous dance is in its very nature an immoral amusement. That the Mohammedan appears to recognize. What must we think of those Christians who 'can see no harm in dancing'?" As an answer to the question we might suggest that they have not studied the Sixth Commandment and that therefore their conscience is not functioning in this respect.

MUELLER.

**Out into the Dark.** — Commenting on the costly burial of the late emperor of Japan, the *Sunday-school Times* writes: "Physical darkness is but a faint shadow of the awfulness of spiritual darkness.



There is no darkness so hopeless and terrible as that into which the soul without the Lord Jesus Christ is plunged when it leaves this mortal body. An Associated Press dispatch from Tokyo told, earlier this month, of the burial of the late Emperor Yoshihito. A crouching, mourning crowd of more than one million of his subjects lined the four-mile road from the imperial palace to the Shinjuku Gardens, where the funeral ceremonies of the 'Son of Heaven,' the lineal descendant of the sun goddess Amaterasu, took place. A huge catafalque, drawn by four black oxen and bearing the body of the late emperor, was the only vehicle in the procession, moving along between swaying lanterns and great braziers of burning fagots. In the wheel hubs of the catafalque were concealed peculiar musical attachments, which emitted a wailing dirge, echoed by the wails of the people lining the roadway. The dispatch continued with a significant sentence: 'All imperial funerals are held in the night-time because the imperial spirit must go from the darkness into darkness.' As the heralded Son of Heaven, Yoshihito should have been light itself. But since the light in him was darkness, how great was the darkness! Truly, the 'god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.' 2 Cor. 4, 4. As we thank God that He has called us out of darkness into His marvelous light, shall we not pray more than ever for those light-bearers who are proclaiming the Gospel in the Land of the Rising Sun, that many, and even the new Emperor Hirohito, may turn to the light ere they, too, slip out of darkness into the dark?"

That includes also the most energetic effort on the part of every true believer in Christ in sectarian circles to discontinue the act of frightfulness of sending modernistic missionaries to Japan, as is being done to-day by many of the most prominent churches of our country.

MUELLER.

#### Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

The *Federal Council Bulletin* for January contains an article by Prof. Arthur E. Holt, of Chicago Theological Seminary, who reports on a survey made of 96 Chicago churches (white), whose average membership is about 230. The object was to determine to what extent the various classes of the city population are represented in the churches. The census statistics of the city ran thus: "Professional, 5.4 per cent.; business men, 8.6 per cent.; clerical, 21 per cent.; skilled manual, 20.6 per cent.; unskilled manual, 36.7 per cent." The survey of Prof. Holt contains the following figures: "In the churches studied the professional workers constituted 9 per cent.; business men (all employers, owners, managers and executives), 6.8 per cent.; the clerical workers, 31.7 per cent.; skilled manual, 17.3 per cent.; unskilled manual, 18.1 per cent." This seems to show that the unskilled labor class is rather keeping aloof from churches. Perhaps these people are affiliating with churches not included in this survey.

Sir Conan Doyle, known the world over as the author of the Sherlock Holmes stories, has written a history of Spiritualism. Extremes meet—the cool, sane, unemotional detective has become the fervent abettor of a fraudulent religion. We have not seen his history of Spiritualism, but from a review of it we glean the information that it has one redeeming feature: its price is next to forbidding—\$7.50.

An English writer (A. B. Cook) has written a book on Zeus, in which he (as a reviewer informs us in the *Hibbert Journal*) advances the theory that "a number of monuments, all more or less columnar in form, originated in a desire to prop up the sky lest it fall." Mr. Cook seems to be a candidate for the first prize for far-fetched conjectures. At any rate, he is weaving a vast amount of fancy into his fabric of facts.

Prof. Breasted of Chicago University, noted Egyptologist, has written a book entitled *The Conquest of Civilization*, in which he has been bold enough to enter the field of Greek history and literature. Speaking of his book, Prof. John A. Scott, an expert in the field of Greek literature, points out several inaccuracies and errors which the famous Dr. Breasted has become guilty of. Dr. Scott says in concluding his discussion: "Clio is a jealous muse, and she is also exceedingly shy." We are moved to add the proverbial *ne ultra crepidam*.

Dr. Dau, in his inaugural address at Valparaiso, quoted Gamaliel Bradford to the effect that "the impression which Mrs. Darwin first had of her husband's theory was that it was 'putting God farther off.'" No one can deny that this is what Darwin's theory has done.

"The scoffing at exactness in outlining and relating the teachings of our Lord which appears in the newspapers and certain magazines compares to quackery in medicine, to demagoguery in political principles, and to amateurism in science. What we frequently see referred to as the 'mind of Christ' is often quite disconnected with what Jesus declared and revealed. It is no more an accurate setting forth of Him than a bus ride across New Jersey would be a survey of North America. Such a trip reveals piles of sand, market gardens, a surf-beaten coast, and great centers of amusement." — *Lutheran*.

The *Lutheran* quotes the philosopher James as follows: "One wonders whether the revival of the belief that poverty is a worthy religious ideal may not be the spiritual reform which our time stands most in need of." That sounds as though James were advocating the view on which monastic life is based. Far better is what the *Lutheran* quotes as the saying of the Bishop of Birmingham; "Not poverty, but unselfishness, is the true Christian ideal." The comment of the *Lutheran* is right: "Riches are a snare to most people, but riches with unselfishness are not a bad combination."

Dr. Albert Henry Newman has been professor of Church History for fifty years. He is a Baptist and is at present a member of the theological faculty of Mercer University, Macon, Ga. In his theological position he is said to be a strong Conservative.

The broadcasting of religious sermons has become a familiar custom in America. Not so in England. Rev. H. W. Fox, of London, in an article in *St. Martin's Review*, speaks of the opposition that has been encountered in the effort to get the religious element into the programs of the Broadcasting Corporation. He expresses the hope that the newly organized corporation which has now taken over the enterprise may be "wise enough and strong enough and Christian enough to turn opposition into consent."

*Watchman-Examiner.*

The *Christian Observer* of Louisville lays claim to being the oldest religious paper in America and, for that matter, in the whole world. It was founded in 1827. An interesting circumstance is that its owners and editors have almost without exception been members of the Converse family. Its theology is that of the Presbyterian Church.

To what an alarming extent unbelief is reigning in colleges and universities was brought out in a debate on an anti-evolution bill in one of our State Legislatures where it was stated that questionnaires sent by the professor of psychology of Bryn Mawr College to the leading colleges of the world had resulted in answers showing that 80 per cent. of the teachers of sociology, 83 per cent. of the teachers of biology and 87 per cent. of the teachers of psychology did not believe in God, and that 73 per cent. of the teachers of sociology, 75 per cent. of the teachers of biology, and 91 per cent. of the teachers of psychology did not believe in a hereafter. The speaker attributed this to the teaching of evolution.



## BOOK REVIEW.

---

**Register zum Homiletischen Magazin.** Jahrgang 39—50. Bearbeitet von *E. Eckhardt*. 48 pages, 6×9. 75 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Those who have the volumes of the *Homiletic Magazine* which are indexed in this book will thank the compiler for his work. Those who do not possess these volumes will, nevertheless, make a good investment if they purchase the book for seventy-five cents; for from it they can get many a suggestion with reference to sermon-texts and sermon-topics.

FRITZ.

**Hymns for Synodical Conventions, Pastors' and Teachers' Conferences, Circuit Meetings, and Similar Occasions.** Selected by *Prof. L. Fuerbringer*. English Edition: 14 pages; 5 cts.; \$2.25 per 100. English-German Edition: 22 pages; 5 cts.; \$2.50 per 100. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The custom of congregations' supplying hymn-books to the worshipers rather than having them bring their own books to the church services, is becoming more general. When, however, synodical conventions or larger conferences and other similar meetings are held, the usual supply of books is inadequate. The hymn folders, for which Dr. Fuerbringer selected the hymns, are to provide an inexpensive way to supply this need, so that all can join in the singing.

FRITZ.

**Faith Unshaken.** A Popular Defense of Christianity. Dedicated to the Young People of Our Church. By *John Theodore Mueller*, Professor of Systematic Theology at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. 100 pages, 5×7½. Cloth cover, 85 cts.; paper cover, 50 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The religious book market of our day is, perhaps as never before, being flooded with books; but, sad to say, many had better never have been written. So much the more does it become our duty to supply the antidote of good religious reading-matter. There is no lack of this in our Lutheran Church; but much of it has been written in German, which no longer strongly appeals to many and which others cannot understand. We ought to welcome every effort, therefore, to give us good literature in the English language. Professor Mueller's latest book, *Faith Unshaken*, helps to supply this need. His essays are short and to the point and will in this respect appeal to the people of our time; for in this age of speed and of multiplicity of activities the demand is not for big books and long chapters and articles, but for a brief and lucid presentation of essentials. Let us not deplore this too much. The more elaborate discussions of former days, unless they were scholarly, detailed elaborations for scholars, were often too verbose. The spirit of our age demands that when one has something to say, it be said in as few words as possible. And we ask, why not?—In his twenty-five apologetic essays Professor Mueller treats such subjects as "The Doctrine Concerning God and Man's Salvation," "The Superiority of Christianity over All Man-made Religions," "Christianity and Its Victorious Power," "Christianity and Miracles," "Christianity and the Resurrection of Christ," "Christianity and Science," "The Great Doc-

trine of Inspiration," "The Virgin Birth of Our Savior," "The Comforting Doctrine of the Atonement," "Christianity and the Lutheran Church." If our church-members, especially also the young people, will study these essays, it will not only strengthen them in their Christian faith, but also supply them with a wealth of material over against false teachers and unbelievers.

FRITZ.

**Luther's Small Catechism.** Edited by the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. With Additional Notes for Students, Teachers, and Pastors. By *Edward W. A. Koehler*, instructor in Concordia Teachers' College, River Forest, Ill. \$1.50, plus 10 cts. postage. (Koehler Publishing Co., 496 Monroe Ave., River Forest, Ill.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Some books are of such a nature that the mere notice suffices that they have appeared. Others again have to be mentioned with the warning, "Do not buy. Bad investment." But then there are a few concerning which the reviewer feels he would like to shout from the housetops, "Buy them by all means." The book under consideration is of the latter kind. It is extraordinarily useful. Pastors and teachers know that instructing classes in the Catechism is about as difficult a task as any that can confront an educator. We have an official exposition of Dr. Luther's Catechism, it is true, but to point out what is essential and salient in the various questions and proof-texts remains far from easy. Professor Koehler wishes to help his brethren who are teaching the Catechism. The notes which he offers were originally dictated in the classroom, and there their worth was proved. Former students urged that the notes be printed, and fortunately for the Church the author has consented. We have no rhetorical effusions here, no striving after elegance of language. The remarks of the author are simple, brief, to the point. But they always go to the very heart of the matter under discussion. Professor Koehler is a man of remarkable acumen and dialectic skill and defines the various concepts with precision. The book thus far has been very favorably received. May it continue to win friends and thus to assist our pastors and teachers in that most blessed work, the indoctrination of our children and young people! Perhaps those professors at our synodical colleges to whom the religious instruction has been entrusted will find upon examination that they might with profit introduce this annotated Catechism in their courses.

**Sche-Erith Isroel.** Order sample copies from Rev. N. Friedmann, 823 Jennings St., New York, N. Y.

This paper is the Yiddish quarterly which our brethren in New York have begun to issue in the interest of our mission-work among the Jews. The title means, "The Remainder of Israel." The price is 25 cts. a year. Let all those who have an opportunity to bring the Gospel to Jewish people procure a few copies of this little paper of sixteen pages, which seems well adapted to be used as a tract.

**Allerlei aus Gottes Garten.** Gotteslehren in kurzer Form. Von *Dr. C. M. Zorn*. 334 pages. 90 cts. (Verlag von Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The aged and venerable pastor Dr. C. M. Zorn is, according to his own statement, waiting and writing. He is waiting for the blessed hour in

which the Lord will call him to his rest. In the mean while he keeps himself busy writing popular expositions of Scripture and timely elucidations of the Christian faith. In his *Gotteslehren* he follows his old and tried method of letting Scripture interpret itself, or of letting God's Word do the teaching, arguing, and convincing. His own words merely serve to supply an outline and the background. Each topic covers about a page and is of vital significance. The subjects may be roughly divided into two classes, doctrinal and practical. Some of the doctrinal heads are: "Allgemeine Rechtfertigung," "Gesetz und Evangelium," "Die Sintflut," "Der Antichrist," "Chiliasmus," "Allgemeine Judenbekehrung." Practical subjects are: "Kuvertsystem," "Kinos," "Kirchenpolitik," "Logen," "Fanatisch," "Die grosse Armee." We recommend the book not only to our laymen, but also to our younger pastors, as a ready reference in case they are suddenly called upon to explain the topics here discussed. MUELLER.

**Die innere und aeußere Stellung einer christlichen Gemeinde gegen das Weltwesen.** Synodical Report of the Ev.-Luth. Freikirche (48th convention). 50 cts. (Schriftenverein [E. Klaerner], Zwickau, Sachsen.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

It is an important and well-written essay which is here offered to the Church. The author of it is Pastor Albert Huebener, Kolberg. The report of the business transactions is likewise of interest to all friends of true Lutheranism.

**Introduction to the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church.** By J. L. Neve, D. D. With contributions by George J. Fritschel, D. D. Second, revised edition. 1926. 454 pages, 5½×8. \$2.75. (The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The subtitle of this book is: "A Historical Survey of the Ecumenical and Particular Symbols of Lutheranism, an Outline of Their Contents, and an Interpretation of Their Theology on the Basis of the Doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession." Dr. Neve is professor of History, of Doctrine and Symbolics, in Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College (U. L. C.), Springfield, O., and Dr. Fritschel is professor of Church History and Symbolics in Wartburg Seminary (Iowa Synod), Dubuque, Iowa.

The greater part of the book (pp. 83 to 354) is devoted to the Augsburg Confession and its Apology. The other symbols of Lutheranism are discussed in the 90 pages which follow, half of this being accorded the Formula of Concord. Dr. Neve treats the Ecumenical Creeds and the Augsburg Confession, Dr. Fritschel the other confessional writings.

The authors uphold the unaltered Augsburg Confession as the authentic statement of Lutheran doctrine, while the theology of the *Variata* "is a constant temptation for the adherents to the Augsburg Confession to lose themselves in the direction of indifference to the old historical issues between Lutheranism and Calvinism and in the direction of synergism. . . . Therefore the qualification *unaltered* is of importance to-day in the formula of confessional subscription." (p. 110.) Very good. Concerning the doctrine of conversion, Professor Neve writes: "The Lutheran doctrine is that



man, being dead in sins, can contribute not the least. On the contrary, as far as he is concerned, he will by his nature only resist. (See Art. II of F. C.) God is moved by His grace to help this lost and condemned creature. . . . Not because the sinner is in some measure good or better in some way than others or for anything in man, but because God is gracious and merciful, Christ offers Himself as the gift. Man must accept this free gift. And even this act of receiving and accepting, this taking over, is attributed by the Scriptures to God as the Author of everything that is good." (p. 159 f.) We say, very good, all the more so since nothing else in the book is intended to diminish the inclusiveness of these sentences. As regards the confessional principle, Dr. Neve says: "Lutheran churches and organizations are representatives of the true Church of Christ only in so far as they actually live up to their Confessions in doctrine and practise." (p. 185.) And instancing the difference between Lutherans and Baptists on the Sacrament of Baptism, he remarks: "What the one side accepts as a doctrine of the divine Word the other rejects as human error. It is impossible that, in the sense of our article, both can be the Church 'in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered.'" (p. 188.) Regarding Baptism, the author does not modify the Lutheran doctrine in the manner familiar to us in the writings of General Council theologians (who teach, or have taught, that in Baptism the "germ of spiritual life" is implanted in the nature of the child), but clearly sets forth the specifically Lutheran view: "In Baptism God, in a way that He has not revealed to us, creates faith in the infant child (regenerates, gives spiritual light, receives as His child, or whatever similar terms may be used)." (p. 205.) Returning to the discussion of conversion in his interpretation of Art. XVIII, Neve denies, as we deny, that the Formula of Concord goes beyond the Augsburg Confession in the doctrine of free will. Nothing could be more clear in its denial of human cooperation in conversion than the statement: "The F. C., quoting Luther, says 'that man's will is in his conversion purely passive.' (499, 18; 569, 89.) Even this phrase is not against the doctrine of our article. If the spiritual righteousness is 'wrought in our heart,' and if it is a '*Wirkung*' of the Holy Ghost, who 'renews and purifies us,' and if it is God who 'imparts life and motion' (Melancthon, *Scholia on Colossians*), then man's will is passive in the act of conversion." (p. 288 f.) "Our conclusion is that in the F. C. (Article II) there is no doctrine of free will materially different from that in Article XVIII of the [Augsburg] Confession. It is the original Lutheran doctrine of divine monergism, fortified, of course, against the objections of Philipistic synergism." (p. 290.)

In what respects, then, if any, does this *Introduction* differ from the doctrinal standpoint of the Missouri Synod? Mainly, we would say, in the doctrine of the Church. The discussion of the terms Visible and Invisible Church (pp. 195—199) goes far aside the mark. Again, there is the same difference that prevailed at the time of the founding of the General Council between its leaders and the Missouri Synod theologians regarding the nature and obligations of fellowship. While undoubtedly the book as a whole favors a strict confessional attitude, it throws the doors wide open (as did Seiss and others in their day) to a sinful Unionism by allowing certain exceptions to the rule that pulpit-fellowship is permissible only

where there is unity of doctrine. (p. 193.) Regarding the ministerial call, the General Council view, familiar to us in the writings of Jacobs, Gerberding, and others, is upheld; it is the representative Church and not the congregation alone, that calls. (p. 249.) So important do we deem the dissension on this point which exists within the American Lutheran Church that we intend to devote to it an article, now in the course of preparation for this MONTHLY.

However, there are other statements both by Dr. Neve and by Dr. Fritschel with which the reviewer cannot agree. The statement on page 55 regarding the Descent does not reflect early Christian opinion correctly. We can make nothing of Dr. Neve's condemnation of "an absolute and unfailling predestination." (p. 232.) An "absolute" predestination we, too, deny; but if it is not unfailling, it could not be predestination. Similarly p. 293: "Among the many gems of truth expressed in his [Luther's] *De Servo Arbitrio* there are some predestinarian sentences. He failed to emphasize the universality of God's saving will and wrote as if some were by divine decree excluded from salvation." We cannot assent to this. On the other hand, Dr. Fritschel goes too far when (p. 441) he says: "After they have reached the assurance that Christ has atoned for their sins and has accepted them through faith as children of God, they can *easily reach absolute certainty* as to God's eternal decree towards them." The italics are Dr. Fritschel's own. The term "absolute" would be tolerable if nothing but the common parlance is intended. In the theological sense it should not be so used. On p. 442 the "*a priori* method" of setting forth the doctrine of predestination is simply identified with Calvinism. What was wrong with Calvin and what is wrong with Calvinistic theology is not the "*a priori* method" of presentation, but the teaching of an absolute decree of election and of a parallel decree of reprobation, which denies the universality of redemption.

The discussion of the Sabbath stops at the half-way house; it leaves the Christian in bondage to a day both on the civil side (which is right) and on the religious (which is wrong). (p. 264; but see p. 382.)

The proof-reading has been very imperfectly done. Aside from numberless instances of misspelled words, misplaced brackets and quotation marks, there are particularly irritating typographical errors on pp. 64 (some nature for same nature), 192 (misplacement of footnote), 200 (theme for there), 205 (lines misplaced), 250 (brackets missing in last sentence), 276 (five errors on this one page!), 278 (duplicate reference), 282 (determination for determinism), 291 (*usque* for *utriusque*), 297 (last word wanting), 406 (Antinomianism), 431 (Te for He).

The scholarship of the book satisfies the demands of a manual of Lutheran symbolism. The text of the Augsburg Confession especially has been studied with reference to the latest finds. The copious footnotes testify to the erudition of the authors. GRAEBNER.

**The Truth of Faith.** By *John A. W. Haas*, President of Muhlenberg College. \$1.00. (United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia.)

"The purpose of this volume," says the author, "is to make it possible for the college teacher in religion somewhere in his courses to give the full statement of New Testament truth in its own worth to the student."

In many colleges "these courses mostly approach the New Testament solely from the literary point of view and give little attention to the inner truth. There is also a historical method, which is shot through with criticism not only of the text, but also of the content." Dr. Haas stands for the Lutheran method. "The only guide in these conflicting currents of present religion," he says, "is the teaching of the New Testament in its directness and simplicity." He consequently recognizes that "there is a standard value in the old dogmatic." His Scriptural presentation of the great doctrines of sin, of redemption, the person of Christ, the personal union, the communication of attributes, the vicarious atonement, the means of grace, justification, sanctification, the Church, the ministry, hell, heaven, etc., etc., buttressed throughout by copious Scripture-proof, is most valuable, and the reader who follows the author's advice ("This is no book for careless reading, but for earnest examination, with the New Testament constantly in hand") cannot but grow in the knowledge of the saving truth, the more so as the author does not hesitate to point out the respective gross and fine aberrations of modern theology — on the death of Jesus (being nothing more than the exhibit of divine love), the immanence of God, the Virgin Birth, the modern attitude of undervaluing the final fulfilment of faith, etc., the millennial dreams of the Fundamentalists, woman's preaching, etc., etc. We sincerely wish we could herewith close our review and say with the *Lutheran*: "Anybody who will read and study it, with the New Testament in hand, will find it difficult to discover where in any of its parts it is out of harmony with the faith of the Confessions." We are compelled to point out that parts of it cannot be harmonized with the Confessions. Dr. Haas presents the modern Lutheran, not the confessional Lutheran, teaching on inspiration. "When the interpretation of this revelation is to be given, it is guaranteed by the guidance of the Spirit, who keeps it correct and pure. As the specifically selected prophets and apostles give utterance to revelation, they are upheld by the Spirit, who fills their words with the authoritative truth. This is inspiration." (p. 41.) The phrase "guidance of the Spirit" repeatedly occurs, never the term verbal, plenary inspiration. "There is a truly human side in the historical and descriptive references." (p. 39.) If "human side" means merely the writers' own style and mode of expression, the phrase must not be restricted to "the historical and descriptive references." "The historical process, by which it [the New Testament] became a record of revelation that contained the authoritative revelation." (p. 41.) That is the modern phraseology; does it present the modern view? On page 43 we find the fine statement: The believer "knows that the things given of God can be spoken, not in words which man's wisdom teaches, but only in words 'which the Holy Ghost teacheth.' 1 Cor. 2, 13." If the author is willing to have this statement express verbal inspiration, we are very willing greatly to modify our first statement. — "We have more than this mediated historical knowledge in the inner appropriation of Christ through which we learn to know Him and the reality and power of His truth." (p. 18.) Modern theology bases faith on "experience," not on the Word of Scripture. Where does Dr. Haas stand? According to page 20: "Faith finds its justification and reason in the actual, living experience, that takes hold of Christ as mediated through the historical message of the



Gospel," it would seem that he stands on the Confessions, but according to page 45: "—our own Christian experience and the demand urged upon us by what Christ means to us in our spiritual life is best explained and secures its fullest satisfaction when it is in agreement with the record of the New Testament," it would seem that he puts, in the modern way, experience first and the Word second.

We cannot favor the introduction of this book as a text-book into Lutheran colleges. It teaches synergism. "While God begins and continues His work in man, there is a willingness or unwillingness on the part of man. The power and effect of the new life does not come through the channel of subconsciousness, but is presented to clear consciousness and to the choice of the will." (p. 118.) "While the new birth is the creative act of God, conversion is the response and reaction which man presents to the work of God." (p. 117.) "Paul ascribes everything to divine grace without denying human responsibility and action." (p. 119.) "We must nevertheless remember that, while we can turn to God or away from Him, there is no merit in our attitude. We deserve no credit; for God begins the good work in us, and our salvation in its inception and foundation is not due to our cooperation." (p. 120.) "It depends upon us whether we will let faith have its way, and yet the willingness of our will is called forth by God. Phil. 2, 12, 13." (p. 17.) The second clause should have forbidden the penning of the first clause. "There is no condition forced upon men without their will and readiness to follow the drawing and to allow their hearts to burn." (p. 118.) Surely there is no condition forced upon men, but that does not justify the remainder of the statement. The Formula of Concord rejects it: "As to the expression of ancient and modern teachers of the Church, when it is said: *Deus trahit, sed volentem trahit, i. e.,* God draws, but He draws the willing, . . . these expressions do not conform to the form of sound doctrine, and therefore, when we speak of conversion to God, justly ought to be avoided." (*Trigl.*, p. 789.) "There is a complete change of thought and life, and this is not effected by our own striving" (p. 105), is a strong monergistic statement, but it cannot neutralize the strong synergistic statements put forth. — Hopeless confusion results where the call, enlightenment, repentance, and regeneration are treated as separate and successive works of the Spirit and repentance as contrition and repentance as conversion is not differentiated. The Confessions use these terms as synonyms. — The following quotations, we think, will give a fair view of Dr. Haas's teaching on predestination: "It is thus through the action of men that the universal will of God is changed into the selection of particular men." (p. 71.) "Even some of those called did not remain as the chosen. Matt. 22, 14." (p. 103.) "But it is only as men oppose the will of God that they cannot draw themselves up into the faith to eternal life. Acts 13, 48. The Greek word *tetagmenoi* is not necessarily passive, but rather middle mood. . . . The English translation 'ordained' is incorrect." (p. 72.) In passing, we might quote Thayer on this passage: "As many as were appointed (*A. V.*, ordained) [by God] to obtain eternal life, or to whom God decreed eternal life"; and the *Expositor's Greek Testament*: "Some take the word as if middle, not passive: 'as many as had set themselves unto eternal life.' . . . This rendering *may* be adopted," not: must be adopted. And as to the matter in hand, does Dr. Haas adopt

the translation: "As many as had set themselves unto eternal life believed"? And seeing that the Formula of Concord applies this text to prove that election is a cause of faith (*Trigl.*, p. 1065), we might have expected that he would adduce some other, some pertinent text to prove the matter if he agrees with the substance of the statement of the Formula of Concord. We cannot agree with the following statements: "Although mankind knew that the Law was spiritual and desired to do the right, they were carnal, sold under sin, and did what they hated, Rom. 7, 14 ff." (p. 82); "Whenever the world is spoken of as an object of God's love and of His salvation, it is not the world under sin and condemnation, John 3, 16; 12, 47"; "The purpose of the descent of Christ into Hades was to preach to the spirits in prison, 1 Pet. 3, 19; those who disobeyed in the past were now to have the Gospel preached to them, 1 Pet. 4, 6, and to receive the benefit of the propitiation" (p. 95); "In the fulness of time the Jews will again be called and believe, Rom. 9—11" (p. 105); "Along with the return of Israel . . . the man of sin, the Antichrist, will appear" (p. 152); and others. — It grieves us deeply that a book which we would like to recommend for its clear and powerful presentation of many, of most of the doctrines of Scripture had to be marred by aberrations in several important doctrines.

E.

**The Parables of the Old Testament.** By *Clarence Edward Macartney*. New and enlarged edition. 201 pages. \$1.50. (Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.)

Dr. C. E. Macartney is pastor of the Arch St. Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, and his doctrinal position may be defined as that of a mediating Fundamentalist. In this book he presents fifteen sermons, or rather addresses, delivered on as many parables of the Old Testament, some of which are "The Parable of the Trees," Judg. 9, 7—20; "The Parable of the Thistle and the Cedar," 2 Kings 14, 8—14; "The Parable of the Ewe Lamb," 2 Sam. 12, 1—23; "The Parable of the Two Eagles and the Vine," Ezek. 17. Each parable is applied to present-day conditions in the Church and the Christian life, and usually the addresses close with a most earnest appeal to accept Christ and His salvation. The value of these addresses consists in pointing out how the Old Testament parables may be used for pulpit-work. — At the same time, however, a most earnest warning is in place; for the addresses are not always doctrinally sound, and to a large extent the applications and lessons are quite far-fetched. The Arminian background appears clearly in the first address, where in proof of the statement that "life is what you make it" the author quotes the lines: "I am the master of my fate; I am the captain of my soul." Similar errors are found throughout the book.

MUELLER.

**Ministerial Life and Work.** By *W. H. Griffith Thomas, D. D.* An abridgment of *The Work of the Ministry*, by his wife. 236 pages, 5½×8. (The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, Ill.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The author treats the man and his work. The book contains some good chapters on preaching. It will be stimulating to any pastor to read a book of this kind once a year; it will help him to examine himself occasionally in reference to his life and work.

FRITZ.







---

---

## Faith Unshaken.

The Christian religion is of God, and like its divine Author it abides through the ages, no matter how great the hatred, mockery, and persecution of the gates of hell may be. Around this thought are gathered the chapters of *Faith Unshaken*, a new book by Prof. J. T. Mueller.

*Faith Unshaken* is a defense of the truth of Christianity, and a manifestation of the glory of its Bible and of the power of its divine message. In its pages the beauty and truth of the Christian religion are depicted in popular, but dignified language. Beginning with a hortatory chapter, addressed to the confirmands, it treats, to name only a few of the subjects: "The Superiority of Christianity over All Man-made Religions"; "Christianity and Its Fruits"; "Christianity and Its Victorious Power"; "Christianity and Its Divine Author"; "Christianity and Science"; the doctrine of the "Virgin Birth," the "Inspiration," the "Atonement," the "Trinity," the "Resurrection of the Body," "Christianity and Its Missionary Program," "Christianity and Its Adherents," "Christianity and the Lutheran Church," etc. Every chapter is complete and brimful of valuable, practical information.

It is a book which the pastor might place into the hands of his confirmands or which parents or friends might give to those whom they love as an antidote against the shallow infidelity of our age. It furnishes collateral reading for adult catechumens and may also be given to our young men and women as they go forth into the world where the blight of unbelief may destroy everlastingly their tender faith.

The book contains 100 pages 5×7½, and may be had in two editions. Stiff cloth covers, with gilt-stamped title-page and back-bone, 85 cts.; flexible paper covers, 50 cts.

**CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,**  
3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

---

---